Mr. Nilgiri G. Sanjiviah.—

Is it not on account of such light punishment that excise contractors continue to commit these offences ?

Second Member of Council.—

That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. Bagamane Deva Gowda.—

Are the Government aware that one of the contractors referred to was maintaining a big and costly establishment and if so, has not the cancellation of his license resulted in serious loss to him ?

Secretary to Government, Development Department.—

When he has committed an offence, he must be prepared for the consequences thereof.

MESSRS. P. SUBBARAMA CHETTY (Special Interests), V. VENKATAPPA (Chennapatna Taluk), W. H. HANUMANTHAPPA (Bangalore City Municipality) and BELUR SRINIVASA IYENGAR (Bangalore Taluk).—

Q.—5. Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) What is the action that the Government have taken on the resolution of the Legislative Council, regarding the opening of muzrai temples to Harijans (Adikarnatakas) and on the resolution of the Representative Assembly requesting the Government to introduce legislation for abolition of untouchability in the State ?

(*b*) If no action has so far been taken, what action do the Government propose taking in the near future ?

FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT.—

A.—5. (*a*) and (*b*) When these subjects were discussed in the Legislative Council and the Representative Assembly, Government set forth the practical difficulties involved in carrying out the resolutions in the form in which they were framed. In view of such difficulties, Government are unable to take any action on the lines indicated in the resolutions.

Supplementary Questions and Answers.

Mr. P. Subbarama Chetty.—

If the Government are unable to take action for the abolition of untouchability on the lines indicated in the resolution referred to, in what other way will they take action to achieve the desired end ?

Financial Secretary to Government.—

That is a separate matter.

Mr. P. Subbarama Chetty.—

Do Government at all intend taking action in regard to the abolition of untouchability ?

Second Member of Council.—

The member is quite aware of what Government have already done to help the Adikarnatakas.

Mr. P. Subbarama Chetty.—

I am not referring to help to Adikarnatakas. But, what have the Government done so far for the abolition of untouchability ?

Second Member of Council.—

When the resolution regarding that point came up for discussion, Government set forth the practical difficulties in the way of accepting it. But the very fact that all Government schools have been thrown open for depressed classes students also is an instance to show that Government are not unmindful of the need for uplifting the depressed classes.

Mr. P. Subbarama Chetty.—

But, has the order in respect of throwing open all Government schools to depressed classes students been put into practical effect in all places in the State ? I doubt it, because it is not in force except in Mysore and Bangalore Cities.

Second Member of Council.—

The question is not whether effect has been given to orders issued, but what the Government have done so far.

Mr. P. Subbarama Chetty.—

Any way, what are the difficulties in the way of Government giving effect to the resolution about untouchability ?

Second Member of Council.—

The difficulties have been explained at great length in the course of the discussion on the resolution. For the present, in regard to temple entry, Government have no desire to take any action.

Mr. P. Subbarama Chetty.—

At least, will the depressed classes be permitted to use drinking water from Government tanks ?

Second Member of Council.—

Government for their part have no objection.

Mr. P. Subbarama Chetty.—

What have the Government done in regard to the recent Mandya tank affair ?

Second Member of Council.—

That case has been considered and final orders have been passed.

Mr. P. Subbarama Chetty.—

Has it come to the notice of Government that even in such a small State as Sandur, the depressed classes have been permitted to enter temples and if so, why not the same thing be adopted here also ?

Second Member of Council.—

We are not concerned with what is or is not done in other States.

Capt. Y. V. Ayya.—

Granting that Government will issue an order that all the temples will be thrown open to Harijans, are Government sure that they will have the support of the masses ?

Mr. Y. K. Channaveerappa.—

Is there any rule that Harijans should not take water from wells and tanks ?

Second Member of Council.—

No.

Mr. T. Mariappa.—

Is it not a fact that Harijans are allowed entry into the temples at Belur, Halebid and Melkote?

Second Member of Council.—

Yes, for one day in a year.

Mr. T. Mariappa.—

If they are admitted for one day, cannot they be admitted on other days also?

Second Member of Council.—

No. It cannot be done for the present.

Mr. H. C. Dasappa.—

May I know what are the difficulties in the way of admitting them for more than one day?

Second Member of Council.—

Government cannot go against an age-long *mamool.*

Mr. H. C. Dasappa.—

If they are admitted, will it pollute either the Gods or the devotees?

Second Member of Council.—

I can only say that Government cannot take any action in regard to the temple entry affair for the present.

Mr. Nilgiri G. Sanjiviah.—

If all the people concerned agree to allow them into the temples, will Government at least remain neutral?

Second Member of Council.—

Subject to law and order.

Mr. H. C. Dasappa.—

If the Harijans enter the temples, what will be the policy of the Government? Will they obstruct them or keep quiet?

Second Member of Council.—

The policy of Government has been explained already. The District Magistrates will study the situation and take suitable action.

Mr. H. C. Dasappa.—

Is it the intention of Government to uphold age-long *mamools* or to be neutral?

Second Member of Council.—

It all depends upon the circumstances of each case.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

I. Bill to Amend the Criminal Tribes Regulation, VII of 1916.

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, GENERAL DEPARTMENT, explained the general principles of the Bill as follows:—

The Criminal Tribes Regulation VII of 1916, is based on the British Indian Act III of 1911 as amended by Act X of 1914. The Act of 1911 was further amended by Act I of 1923 and the amendments therein were adopted in Mysore by Regulation X of 1925. The British Indian Act of 1911 has been replaced by Act VI of 1924 which has been subsequently amended by Act XXXIII of 1925.

The most important change made in British India is the addition made to Section 10 by the amending Act of 1925. It provides for the automatic application of the Regulation and the rules made thereunder where a member of a criminal tribe, in respect of which a notification under Section 10 has been issued, changes his residence to another district. It also provides for the transfer of the relevant entries in the register to the Superintendent of Police of the latter district.

The only other change of consequence brought about by the British Indian Act is in Section 23 which corresponds to Section 24 of the Mysore Regulation intended to make the meaning of the expressions "second conviction" and "third conviction" appearing therein clear and free from doubt.

It is desirable to bring our Regulation into line with the law in British India. It is therefore proposed to amend Regulation VII of 1916, adopting the substantial changes made in the Act in British India.